

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action dated May 20, 2005. Claims 6, 11, 12 and 14 have been amended and Claim 16 has been cancelled. Please note that the original application papers included Claim 16 but the preliminary amendment filed with the original application papers did not include Claim 16. Claims 1 to 15 are in the application with Claims 1 and 6 being the only independent claims. Favorable reconsideration, in view of the above amendments and accompanying remarks, is respectfully requested.

Regarding the priority issue on page 2 of the Official Action, submitted herewith is a separate paper filing the front page and the second page from PCT published patent application number WO 03/015980 A1 (international application number PCT/EP02/08887), which claims priority of Russian patent application number RU 2001122026, filed August 8, 2001. As can be seen on the second page, the PCT patent application designated the "US" (i.e., the United States). Thus, it is believed that the priority claim in the instant application is in order.

In the Official Action on page 2, the Examiner has rejected Claims 11 to 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reason noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to these claims overcome these rejections.

In the Official Action on page 5, the Examiner has allowed Claims 1 to 5.

In the Official Action on pages 3 to 5, the Examiner has rejected Claims 6 to 8 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan 1-91930. These rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the amendments to the claims.

Method Claim 6 has been amended to include the limitations set forth in product Claim 1. Thus, since Claim 1 has been allowed by the Examiner, it is believed that Claim 6, along with dependent Claims 9 to 15, are in condition for allowance.

In the Official Action on page 5, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 9 and 10 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 11 to 14 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed above,

Claims 9 to 14 depend from Claim 6 and thus, are believed to be patentable for those reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 6.

In view of the above amendments and accompanying remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner does not believe that the above remarks and amendments place the application in condition for allowance, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions, it is requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants attorney at (419) 255-5900 to discuss the application prior to the issuance of an action in this case by the Examiner.